



**City of Burbank
Park, Recreation and
Community Services Department**

Memorandum

Date: February 14, 2013

To: Park, Recreation and Community Services Board Members

From: Judie Wilke, Park, Recreation and Community Services Director

Subject: **DISCUSS THE VIABILITY OF DEVELOPING AN OFF-LEASH DOG PARK AND THE FORMATION OF A TASK FORCE**

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Park, Recreation and Community Services (PRCS) Board discuss the viability of developing an off-leash dog park. Staff further recommends that the Board recommend to the City Council that staff be directed to work with the Board rather than a task force to develop recommendations for the development of a dog park as staff believes the Board is the appropriate body to fulfill this role.

Staff also requests that the Board provide direction on the following discussion points: identify a suitable location, identify potential site amenities that should be included in this project to help estimate development costs, identify and/or recommend additional funding sources that should be pursued, provide direction regarding the type of operational models that should be explored and identify and/or recommend any potential partnerships that should be pursued.

BACKGROUND:

The development of a dog park has been a topic of discussion since 1997. More recently, on March 11, 2010 staff provided the Board with an informational update on the potential development of a dog park. In summary the Board unanimously supported staff efforts and agreed that the development of a dog park would fit within the mission of the PRCS Department.

The Board was in favor of developing a dog park at the Wood Lot Area near the Starlight Bowl. However, due to the economic climate at that time, the Board felt it would not be an appropriate time to expand or enhance the City's park amenities. The Board expressed concern that the City may not have the resources to fund and maintain the project at that time. Before moving forward, the Board suggested that staff work to

identify alternative funding sources such as grant opportunities and corporate partnerships/sponsorships.

On April 6, 2012, staff provided the Council with a memo summarizing efforts made to explore the viability of developing such a facility (Exhibit A). Staff recommended that this project be brought back as a first step in the two-step agenda process. Given that no action was taken, this item was incorporated into the PRCS Department's Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-2012 Work Program Goal (WPG).

At the August 28, 2012 City Council meeting, Council Member Talamantes requested that staff look into the viability of developing a dog park within the City. As a result, the Council directed staff to incorporate this project in the PRCS Department's FY 2012-2013 WPG.

On December 4, 2012, staff presented a report to the Council which discussed the viability of developing a dog park as the first step in the two-step agenda process (Exhibit B). While, staff advised the Council that the development of a dog park is viable and aligns with the PRCS Department's overall mission, staff expressed a concern over the PRCS Department's existing aging facilities and its ability to support an additional park.

In summary, staff recommended that improvements be made to the PRCS Department's existing infrastructure before adding any additional park amenities to the City's inventory because many of the facilities are well over 60 years old. The Council supported staff's recommendation and directed staff to focus on addressing the PRCS's Department's existing infrastructure needs. However, the Council also directed staff to work with the Board to discuss the following: the viability of establishing a task force; identifying three suitable locations, estimating development costs, identifying funding sources, exploring operational models, and identifying potential partnerships. The Council further recommended that a white-paper be prepared to be considered as part of the FY 2013-2014 Budget process.

DISCUSSION:

In alignment with the Council's direction, staff requests that the Board provide input on the following discussion points: establishing a task force, identifying three suitable locations, estimating development costs, identifying funding sources, exploring operational models and identifying potential partnerships.

Establishing a Task Force

Task forces are work groups typically comprised of experts in specified areas of knowledge or practice. Task forces are small groups of people brought together to accomplish a specific objective and disband when the objective has been achieved.

The City has traditionally used task forces to assist staff through an advisory capacity to study and develop recommendations on various projects and programs within the City before they are presented for consideration to the City Council. Examples of task forces

established by the City include the following: the Blue Ribbon Task Force on Fences, Walls and Hedges, the Transit Services Task Force and the Sustainable Burbank Task Force (now known as the Sustainable Burbank Commission). Each of the task forces had a specific objective to accomplish and all excluding the Sustainable Burbank Commission disbanded because their objectives were achieved.

The formation of a task force for this project would specifically focus on developing recommendations for the development of an off-leash dog park. The task force could be used to develop recommendations for the following decision points: identifying a suitable location, estimating development costs, identifying funding sources, exploring operational models and identifying potential partnerships.

While a task force could be created, staff believes that a more prudent approach would be to use the Board as the community group to develop recommendations to the City Council. Given that the Board has been intimately involved in this project since its inception and combined with the fact that the Board has the ability to hold special meetings to engage the community, staff believes that the Board has the expertise and knowledge to provide solid recommendations to the City Council when considering the development of an off-leash dog park.

To ensure widespread community involvement, staff is recommending that a survey be prepared and completed by residents to better understand the public's perception surrounding the development of an off-leash dog park. A survey has been drafted which could be advertised on the City's website, various public counters and at any animal associated businesses if permitted (Exhibit C). Should it be the desire of the Board and the Council to further pursue this project, staff will ensure that the Board is provided with an opportunity to review and comment on the proposed survey before it is distributed. In the meantime, staff will conduct a municipality survey to establish a best practice or benchmark on how to best approach this project.

Identifying a Suitable Location

Before selecting a suitable location its best to explain the different types of off-leash dog parks. Off-leash dog parks are defined by their service area, size and function. Service area refers to the population areas measured by a mile-radius generally served by a specific type of dog park. The table below summarizes the different type of dog parks which have been categorized by their size and function (Table 1):

Table 1 – Types of Dog Parks

DOG PARK TYPE	DESIREABLE SIZE	SERVICE AREA
Regional (Large)	> 10 Acres	Countywide
Community (Medium)	2-10 Acres	5-Mile Radius
Neighborhood (Small)	½ - 2 Acres	Up to 2-Mile Radius

Regional Dog Parks (Large): Regional off-leash dog parks are intended to be larger than ten acres in size and have a countywide service area. They are generally located in natural, unfenced, open space areas. However, they may also be located within large

multi-use parks if there is sufficient area and user conflicts are minimized. Care must be taken when choosing sites for regional dog parks to mitigate potential negative impacts in highly sensitive areas such as wetlands, riparian areas, high value habitat areas, and protected water-sheds.

Regional dog parks located in natural areas may have fewer amenities than medium to small sized dog parks due to their remote location and/or undeveloped nature. Common amenities may include but are not limited to the following: looping unpaved or paved trails, gravel or paved parking areas, dog waste dispensers, trash receptacles, regulatory signage, and restrooms and drinking fountains if feasible.

Community Dog Parks (Medium): Community off-leash dog parks generally range in size from two to ten acres. They are intended to serve multiple municipal jurisdictions and have a service radius of approximately five miles.

Community dog parks are typically fully fenced for control and safety, and are internally divided by fencing to allow for separate large and small dog activity areas. The separated fenced areas also allow for the rotation or resting for areas if required for ongoing maintenance operations. These medium sized dog parks generally receive heavy use and may contain the following amenities: double gated entryways, paved paths, drinking fountains for people and dogs, waste bag dispensers, trash receptacles, shade structures, paved parking, benches, restrooms, and regulatory signage.

When possible, it is encouraged that community dog parks be developed to have three separately fenced areas. This would include one large area that should be surfaced with quick growing, fast-healing turf grass that can withstand the most wear and tear; second large area that should be surfaced with a non-organic material such as decomposed granite, and a third smaller area that may be surfaced with turf grass or a non-organic granular material.

Neighborhood Dog Parks (Small): Neighborhood off-leash dog parks are generally one and a half to two acres in size and serve one or more neighborhood areas. They are fully fenced for control and safety and generally contain the following amenities: perimeter fencing, double gated entryways, paved paths, drinking fountains for people and dogs, waste bag dispensers, trash receptacles, benches and regulatory signage.

Due to the built out nature of the City and the availability of land, staff is recommending that either a Community Dog Park (Medium) or Neighborhood Dog Park (Small) be considered for development. Both of these facilities would provide an adequate level of service to the community.

When selecting a suitable location, the following should be considered: proximity to other dog parks, adjacent land use compatibility, environmental considerations, vehicular and pedestrian access, visibility and neighborhood concerns.

Proximity to Other Dog Parks: Proximity to other dog parks is directly related to the service areas as previously discussed. The goal is to develop a new dog park without significantly overlapping service areas to maximize available resources. Currently, there

are a total of eight dog parks located relatively adjacent to the City. The table below summarizes the dog park facilities that are accessible to Burbank residents (Table 2).

Table 2 – Dog Park Facilities Accessible to Burbank Residents

FACILITY NAME	CITY/LOCATION	EST DISTANCE*
Griffith Park Dog Park	Los Angeles / Griffith Park	0.18 miles
Whitnall Dog Park	Los Angeles / North Hollywood	1.00 miles
Runyon Canyon Dog Park	Los Angeles / Hollywood	2.00 miles
Laurel Canyon Dog Park	Los Angeles / Studio City	6.00 miles
Silver Lake Dog Park	Los Angeles / Silver Lake	6.00 miles
Sepulveda Basin Dog Park	Los Angeles / Encino	10.00 miles
Barrington Dog Park	Los Angeles / Brentwood	14.00 miles
Westminster Dog Park	Westminster	32.00 miles

*Estimated from the City of Burbank's borders

Two of the facilities identified in the table above (Griffith Park Dog Park and Whitnall Dog Park) are less than one mile away from the City's border (Exhibit D).

Adjacent Land Use Compatibility: Staff's preliminary research has identified both real and perceived concerns related to adjacent land use compatibilities of off-leash facilities. Most issues and concerns identified (noise level of barking dogs, smell of dog waste, parking issues, etc.) arise when the adjacent land use is residential. Dog parks should be located to minimize conflicts with existing and/or planned land uses.

Dog parks may be located within other recreational areas as well; however, due to the limited availability of parkland within the City, off-leash facilities should be balanced with the demands of other recreational and parkland users. Another factor to consider is the compatibility with other recreational uses.

Environmental Considerations: When a natural area is being considered for a dog park, the area should be analyzed to determine if there are any environmentally sensitive lands such as wetlands, riparian areas, high valued habitat, or protected watersheds within the area prior to it being designated as an off-leash facility. Preference should be given to sites that are not environmentally sensitive. Consideration should also be taken to ensure that the proposed site has no harmful foliage within the immediate vicinity of the facility.

Vehicular and Pedestrian Access: The desired level of vehicular and pedestrian access varies according to the location of the facility and the adjacent land uses. Dog parks should be located in an area that is accessible for the community to use. Onsite parking is not necessary but is highly recommended to avoid impacts to the adjacent area.

Visibility: The desired level of visibility of a dog park also varies according to its type, location and adjacent uses. In general, the goal is to design dog parks in a manner highly visible from those who pass by, adjacent users and the community in general. Techniques for increasing good visibility include:

- Locating dog parks adjacent to roadways and streets.
- Locating dog parks that can be seen from other uses (i.e. residences, commercial/public buildings, transportation or path and trail corridors).
- Providing street signage and site or trailhead lighting for added security and extended hours of use.

Staff has identified eleven potential sites for the Board to consider (Exhibit E). Many of these sites have previously been reviewed and discussed by the Board.

As previously recommended by the Board, the Wood Lot Area (No. 9) near the Starlight Bowl could be identified as a viable location for such a facility. In addition, Johnny Carson Park South, City-Owned Property (No. 4), Whitnall Highway Easement City-Owned Property (No. 5) and Interstate 5 – HOV Right of Way, City-Owned Property (No. 11) could also be considered as viable locations. Staff requests that the Board selects and prioritizes three suitable sites for the City Council to consider.

Estimating Development Costs

Development costs are unknown because both a location and specific design element for the project have not been solidified. However, staff anticipates that the development costs for a dog park would range from \$100,000 to \$300,000 depending on the size of the facility and the amenities selected.

Specific design features and amenities for the development of a Community Dog Park (medium) or Neighborhood Dog Park (small) have been summarized for the Board to review (Exhibit F). These standards provide a guideline for what is recommended for each type of dog park. Certain features and amenities listed may be expanded or eliminated based on site specific constraints and challenges or available resources. This resource list will be further developed upon the conclusion of the two surveys that staff would like to conduct.

In summary staff believes that the following main design elements and site amenities should be considered for inclusion as part of this project:

- A six foot high perimeter fence with paved entryways to promote containment and safety of dogs, as well as to clearly define the off-leash activity area for enforcement of regulations.
- Separate fenced areas for large and small dogs to segregate the dogs and to allow for use rotation to let surface materials rest.
- A durable long-wearing surface material of turf grass or non-organic granular material.
- A potable water source for human and dog drinking fountains, hose bibs, wash-off stations, cool down stations, maintenance activities and irrigation systems.

Once a location is identified staff will work with the Board to develop a conceptual design for an off-leash dog park. Staff will come back to the Board to further explore the different type of site amenities that could be potentially offered at the selected location.

Identifying Funding Sources

Staff believes that a portion of the development costs could be offset through grant opportunities and corporate partnerships/sponsorships. The table below summarizes the various funding opportunities that could be utilized to fund this project (Table 3):

Table 3 – Summary of Potential Funding Sources

POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE	TYPE OF FUNDING
The PETCO Foundation	Capital Grant – Development Costs
Burbank Residents	Donations – Development Costs In-Kind Donations – Volunteer Labor
Local Business/Corporations	Donations – Development Costs

Given that there are a limited number of grants available, a more grass roots effort will need to be taken to garner funds to support this project. Many municipalities have been successful in developing partnerships with non-profit advocacy groups to raise funds for their facilities. Staff believes that the establishment of an advocacy group would help secure funding to help offset development costs.

A funding source for this project has not been committed. Staff believes that City funds will be needed to design the facility as it is unlikely that grants and donations could be used to fund this component of the project. Design costs could range from \$10,000 to \$25,000 depending on the size of the facility.

Exploring Operational Models

The long term operation of a successful dog park facility is dependent upon on how the facility is maintained. Dog parks are high maintenance facilities that require sufficient staffing and continuous upkeep. The ongoing maintenance for such a facility is currently unknown. However, due to the intense use that these facilities experience maintenance costs are estimated to be approximately 30% more a year when compared to a traditional park. On average the City spends approximately \$14,500 a year to maintain one acre of traditional parkland. Preliminary research has indicated that surface materials, waste bag dispensers and trash receptacles require the most attention and time.

It is unknown if any municipalities within Los Angeles or California utilize corporate sponsorships to offset ongoing maintenance costs for their smaller park facilities and/or amenities. Though this is a standard practice in the private sector where sports arenas, conference centers, and concert venues are named after a corporation to help offset operational costs; the City may want to consider selling the naming rights of this facility to a private corporation to offset any ongoing maintenance costs. It is unknown if there is a currently a market to purchase the naming rights for a dog park facility.

The City of New York is considering selling the naming rights to sponsor facilities and amenities within its park system to offset operational and maintenance costs. The City of New York recently released a Request for Proposal allowing companies, foundations,

or individuals to bid on naming 631 basketball courts and 55 dog runs. This proposal does have several benefits but it also has its fair share of controversies in that essentially the agency would be commercializing the use of their public spaces.

Another option that could be considered is establishing an adopt-a-park program in which volunteers would perform routine or special maintenance activities in adopted areas or any other viable option as determined appropriate by the Council. The City of Sacramento currently operates the partners in parks program which allows volunteers to adopt a playground, playfield, landscape, garden, section of a large park, preserve, or trail. Program volunteers perform routine or special stewardship activities in the adopted areas. Activities vary by season but volunteers provide the following services: gardening, weeding, pruning, planting, brush clearing, spreading mulch, litter and invasive plant removal, and playground or play field preservation or improvement.

The Council will have to weigh the value of implementing similar programs to reduce ongoing maintenance and operational costs associated with a Dog Park. However, should it be the desire of the Council to further pursue any of the options as presented by the Board, additional analysis will need to be performed on the financial implications. It is highly unlikely that the PRCS Department will be able to take on another facility without adding additional staff for the ongoing maintenance.

As part of staff's municipality survey staff will assess how other off-leash dog park facilities are funded and maintained.

Identifying Potential Partnerships

As previously discussed many agencies have built a relationship with non-profit advocacy groups to assist and/or manage their off-leash dog parks. Again, the roles of park advocacy groups are as follows: raise funds for the park, monitor park usage, help enforce park rules and regulations and serve as communication liaisons with City officials, neighborhood residents, and dog owners. Staff believes that such an organization is essential due to the City's limited funding and staffing resources to dedicate to this additional facility.

Should it be the desire of the Board to establish such an advocacy group, staff recommends that the group be established after both a location has been solidified and the Council has endorsed the off-leash dog park project. This group of volunteers would play a crucial role in the day-to-day operations, strategic planning, and advocacy for the project. One of the goals of this group would be to construct a financial plan to raise the funds needed to develop an off-leash dog park.

Staff also believes that the City's Animal Shelter could potentially be utilized as an advocate or partner for the development of such a facility. Preliminary discussions have taken place, but this proposal needs to be further reviewed to fully explore all the potential opportunities that this partnership could create.

CONCLUSION:

In alignment with how the Board has previously prioritized the development of an off-leash dog park project, the PRCS Department will continue its efforts to focus on rehabilitating and maintaining the City's existing infrastructure before adding any additional park amenities to the City's park inventory.

However, because the Council has directed staff to obtain the Board's opinion on the following discussion points: the viability of establishing a task force; identifying three suitable locations, estimating development costs, identifying funding sources, identifying potential partnerships and exploring operational models before presenting a second step report to the Council, staff requests that the Board provide direction and take any desired action as necessary.

LIST OF EXHIBITS:

- Exhibit A: Memo to City Council (April 6, 2010)
- Exhibit B: City Council Report – Step 1 (December 4, 2012)
- Exhibit C: Proposed Community Assessment Survey
- Exhibit D: Duplication of Services Map
- Exhibit E: Potential Sites
- Exhibit F: Summary of Off-Leash Dog Park Design Standards

EXHIBIT A



*City of Burbank
Park, Recreation and
Community Services Department*

Memorandum

Date: April 6, 2010
To: Michael Flad, City Manager
From: Chris Dasté, Park, and Recreation & Community Services Director
Subject: **PLAYLIST ITEM NO: 1162 PROVIDE COUNCIL WITH DETAILED INFORMATION REGARDING THE POSSIBLE ADDITION OF A DOG PARK IN BURBANK INCLUDING FEEDBACK FROM THE PARK, RECREATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES BOARD**

REQUEST:

At the City Council meeting of January 12, 2010, staff was directed to provide the Council with detailed information (white paper) regarding the possible addition of a dog park in Burbank. The Council also directed staff to include feedback from the Park, Recreation and Community Services Board.

BACKGROUND:

In October 1997, several residents expressed to the Council the need to develop a dog park facility in Burbank. The Council was provided with a petition signed by several Burbank residents noting their support to develop an Off-Leash Exercise Dog Park (Dog Park) facility in the City.

The Council requested that this item be added to the Park, Recreation and Community Services Department's (PRCS) Fiscal Year (FY) 1997-1998 Work Program and directed staff to explore the feasibility of adding a Dog Park or dog park area to the City's existing park inventory.

With direction provided, staff and the PRCS Board (Board) toured local dog park facilities, and held a public hearing in January 1998 to receive input from the public about this issue. The Board received oral communications from 18 individuals and reviewed a number of letters and petitions from citizens asking for development of a Dog Park facility in Burbank. The Board discussed prioritizing the items relating to: site selection; parking; determining the need for an EIR or negative declaration; cost

recovery funding responsibilities; liability issues; health issues; maintenance; supervision and code enforcement.

In June 1998, during the FY 1998-1999 annual Budget process, staff submitted a request to receive funding to develop a Dog Park; however, this request was not funded. Although this request was not funded, Council directed staff to continue their efforts in exploring the feasibility of adding a Dog Park or dog park area to the City's existing park inventory. This item remained on the PRCS FY 1998-1999 Work Program until it was removed in October 1998.

On October 8, 1998, the Council held a joint meeting with the Board to further discuss the viability of adding a Dog Park in Burbank. At this meeting, both the Council and the Board decided that because a funding source could not be identified the Dog Park project should be removed from the PRCS FY 1998-1999 Work Program.

On September 7, 1999, at the request of then Councilmember Bob Kramer, City Council viewed a videotape featuring a dog park facility in the City of Huntington Beach. Council discussed the feasibility of developing a Dog Park facility, and directed staff to identify a funding source to develop a Dog Park facility in the City. This item was then added to the PRCS FY 1999-2000 Work Program.

Staff reviewed, discussed, and developed a list of potential sites both within and outside of the City limits with the Board. Over the course of the three presentations in January 2000, February 2000, and March 2000, staff presented twelve potential locations for a Dog Park and provided the Board with the corresponding pros and cons to each site (Exhibit A). Some of the items discussed included: safety personnel to survey existing/potential site; cost of development; environmental issues; size, resident vs. non-resident use, available parking, health issues, support facilities, neighborhood impact, dedicated vs. multi-usage facility, use of existing developed park acres vs. undeveloped park acres, ability to provide sufficient separate areas for small and large dogs and type of surface desired. The Board also studied the possibility of a joint effort with several different agencies including the City of Glendale, the City of Los Angeles, and the County of Los Angeles.

On September 14, 2000, the Council held another joint meeting with the Board to discuss the feasibility of developing a Dog Park. Staff provided the Council and the Board with a chronology of the proposed project and reviewed several potential Dog Park sites as discussed with the Board.

During the FY 2000-2001 annual Budget process, staff submitted a request to receive funding to develop a Dog Park facility; however, this request was not funded. Consequently, due to lack of funding staff discontinued their efforts in exploring the feasibility of adding a Dog Park to the City's existing park inventory.

STATUS:

On March 11, 2010, staff provided the Board with an informational update on the potential development of a Dog Park. The Board unanimously supported staff efforts and agreed that the development of a Dog Park fits within the mission of the Department. (Exhibit B).

Overall, the Board felt that the addition of a Dog Park facility would benefit the community and would provide Burbank residents with another amenity to enjoy. However, due to our current economic climate, the Board felt that it may not be an appropriate time to expand or enhance our park amenities. The Board did express that the City may not have the resources to fund such a project at this time.

It was suggested that staff work to identify alternative funding sources such as grant opportunities and corporate partnerships/sponsorships before moving forward. The Board further recommended that if this project was to move forward, a steering committee should be established to assist staff in developing various options for both the Board and the Council to consider.

Should it be the Council's desire to move forward with this project, staff recommends that this project be brought back as a first step in the one-step, two-step agenda process.

LIST OF EXHIBITS:

- Exhibit A – PowerPoint Presentations to the Park Board
- Exhibit B – March 2010 Park Board Minutes

EXHIBIT B



CITY OF BURBANK Park, Recreation and Community Services Department STAFF REPORT

DATE: December 4, 2012
TO: Ken Pulskamp, Interim City Manager
FROM: Judie Wilke, Park, Recreation and Community Services Director
SUBJECT: COUNCIL MEMBER TALAMANTES' REQUEST TO DISCUSS THE VIABILITY OF DEVELOPING A DOG PARK – STEP 1

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the City Council discuss the viability of developing a dog park as the first step in the two-step agenda process. While staff agrees this would be a great amenity for the community, staff recommends that the Park, Recreation and Community Services (PRCS) Department should focus on rehabilitating and maintaining the City's existing infrastructure needs before adding any additional amenities to its park inventory.

BACKGROUND

The development of a dog park has been a topic of discussion since 1997. In October 1997, several residents expressed to the Council their desire for the development of a dog park facility within the City of Burbank (City). The Council was provided with a petition signed by several Burbank residents noting their support to develop an off-leash exercise dog park facility in the City.

As a result, the Council requested that staff explore the feasibility of adding a dog park to the City's existing park inventory. The Council also requested that this item be added to the PRCS Department's Fiscal Year (FY) 1997-1998 Work Program Goal (WPG).

With direction provided, staff began working with the PRCS Board (Board) to explore the viability of adding a dog park to the City's park inventory. At the Board's January 8, 1998 meeting, the Board conducted a public hearing to receive input on this project.

The Board received oral communications from 18 individuals and reviewed a number of letters and petitions from citizens asking for the development of such a project. After a lengthy discussion, the Board directed staff to prepare a feasibility study and request funding through the FY 1998-1999 Budget process to develop a dog park facility.

During the FY 1998-1999 annual Budget process, staff submitted a request to receive funding to develop a dog park. Although this request was not funded, the Council directed staff to continue their efforts in exploring the feasibility of developing such a facility.

On October 8, 1998, the Council held a Joint Meeting with the Board to further discuss the viability of adding a dog park to the City's park inventory. Ultimately, both the Council and the Board decided that the project should be removed from the PRCS Department's FY 1998-1999 WPG, given that a funding source could not be identified.

On September 7, 1999, at the request of then Council Member Bob Kramer, Council viewed a videotape featuring a dog park facility in the City of Huntington Beach. The Council again discussed the feasibility of developing such a facility and directed staff to identify a funding source to fund this project. The Council also directed staff to reincorporate this item onto the PRCS Department's FY 1999-2000 WPG.

Per the direction of the Council, staff again began working with the Board to review, discuss, and develop a list of potential sites both within and outside of the City limits to develop a dog park. Over the course of the three presentations which were made to the Board (January 13, 2000, February 10, 2000 and March 10, 2000) staff identified twelve potential locations that could accommodate such a facility.

Staff also provided the Board with a detailed analysis of each of the sites proposed and discussed other elements (environmental and operational impacts) associated with this project. During these discussions staff also explored the possibility of developing a joint effort with several different agencies including the City of Glendale, the City of Los Angeles, and the County of Los Angeles to develop and manage such a facility.

On September 14, 2000, the Council held another Joint Meeting with the Board to discuss the feasibility of developing a dog park. Staff provided the Council and the Board with a detailed chronology on the project and reviewed several potential dog park sites as previously discussed with the Board.

During the FY 2000-2001 annual Budget process, staff submitted a request to receive funding to develop a dog park facility; however, this request was not funded. Consequently, due to lack of funding staff discontinued their efforts in exploring the feasibility of adding a dog park to the City's park inventory. This project was removed from the PRCS Department's FY 2000-2001 WPG.

On January 12, 2010 at the request of the Council, staff was directed to provide the Council with detailed information (white paper) regarding the possible addition of a dog park facility. The Council also directed staff to include feedback from the Board. This project was included into the PRCS Department's FY 2010-2011 WPG.

Per the direction of the Council, on March 11, 2010 staff provided the Board with an informational update on the potential development of a dog park (Exhibit A). The Board unanimously supported staff efforts and agreed that the development of a dog park would fit within the mission of the PRCS Department.

Overall, the Board was in favor of developing a dog park at the Wood Lot Area near the Starlight Bowl. However, due to the current economic climate the Board felt that it may not be an appropriate time to expand or enhance our park amenities. The Board expressed a concern that the City may not have the resources to fund and support the project at that time. Before moving forward, the Board suggested that staff work to identify alternative funding sources such as grant opportunities and corporate partnerships/sponsorships.

On April 6, 2010, staff provided the Council with a memo summarizing efforts made to explore the viability of developing such a facility (Exhibit B). Staff recommended that this project be brought back as a first step in the two-step agenda process. Given that no action was taken, this item was incorporated on the PRCS Department's FY 2011-2012 WPG.

At the August 28, 2012 City Council meeting, Council Member Talamantes requested that staff look into the viability of developing a dog park within the City. As a result, the Council directed staff to incorporate this in the PRCS Department's FY 2012-2013 WPG and bring back a discussion regarding the viability of developing a dog park as the first step in the two-step agenda process.

DISCUSSION

Since 1925, the PRCS Department has played an important role in creating a healthy community through diverse and innovative recreation programming. The City has always recognized the importance of setting aside spaces within the community that support the natural environment, provide a home to habitat, provide active and passive recreation opportunities and add to the beauty of the community.

Currently, the City operates and maintains over 41 public parks and facilities. Many of these facilities have been rehabilitated over the years; however, improvements need to be made to many of the PRCS Department's aging infrastructure to accommodate existing program needs and to ensure that the community is provided with the highest level of service. Balancing the demands of the community and ongoing maintenance is a difficult task to achieve.

On September 8, 2011, staff undertook an effort to work with the Board to assess the infrastructure needs of the PRCS Department. Although this effort is still ongoing, the Board worked with staff to develop and prioritize the PRCS Department's infrastructure needs (Exhibit C). The Board adopted a final infrastructure plan at their January 12, 2012 meeting.

The PRCS Department's infrastructure needs have been prioritized into three distinctive groups. Projects identified in Group A indicate that the Board would like these projects to be completed first. Projects identified in Group B indicate that the Board would like these projects to be addressed once projects in Group A are completed. Group C identifies projects that the Board would like to complete but the Board felt that these projects were not an immediate priority.

In summary, the Board unanimously supported the rehabilitation/modernization of both Olive and Verdugo Recreation Centers as their top priorities. Addressing Starlight Bowl seating was the next priority, followed by refurbishment/replacement of all restroom facilities, converting the landfill to a usable park space, and the expansion of hillside trail networks. Notably, all these projects are listed in Group A. The dog park project was listed in Group C. The Board further expressed a need to focus on rehabilitating and maintaining the City's existing infrastructure needs before adding any additional amenities to its park inventory.

The Council should also consider the potential duplication of services. There are a total of eight dog parks located relatively adjacent to the City. The table below summarizes the dog park facilities that are relatively accessible to Burbank residents (Table 1).

Table 1 – Dog Park Facilities Located Accessible to Burbank Residents

FACILITY NAME	CITY/LOCATION	EST DISTANCE*
Griffith Park Dog Park	Los Angeles / Griffith Park	0.18 miles
Whitnall Dog Park	Los Angeles / North Hollywood	1.00 miles
Runyon Canyon Dog Park	Los Angeles / Hollywood	2.00 miles
Laurel Canyon Dog Park	Los Angeles / Studio City	6.00 miles
Silver Lake Dog Park	Los Angeles / Silver Lake	6.00 miles
Sepulveda Basin Dog Park	Los Angeles / Encino	10.00 miles
Barrington Dog Park	Los Angeles / Brentwood	14.00 miles
Westminster Dog Park	Westminster	32.00 miles

*Estimated from the City of Burbank's borders

Two of the facilities identified in the table above (Griffith Park Dog Park and Whitnall Dog Park) are less than one mile away from the City's boarder (Exhibit D). Staff believes that these two facilities adequately provide Burbank residents with nearby access to a dog park facility.

Staff and the Board believe that developing a dog park facility is viable and aligns with the PRCS Department's overall mission; however, due to the fact that the City is relatively built out and given the current economic climate the reality is that there is a limited amount of land and funding resources available to develop such a facility. Nonetheless, should it be the desire of the Council to develop such a facility staff has identified eleven potential sites for the Council to consider (Exhibit E).

FISCAL IMPACT

As the first step in a two-step agenda process, this item is being presented for discussion and additional Council direction; therefore, the fiscal impact is unknown at this time. However, should it be the desire of the Council to develop such a facility, staff anticipates that development costs for a dog park would range from \$100,000 to \$300,000 depending on the size of the facility and the amenities selected.

Staff believes that a portion of the development costs could be offset through grant opportunities and corporate partnerships/sponsorships. At this time, a funding source for this project has not been committed.

The ongoing maintenance for such a facility is currently unknown but it is important to note that dog parks require a significant amount of maintenance when compared to traditional parks. Due to the intense use that these facilities experience the maintenance costs are estimated to be approximately 30% more a year. On average the City spends approximately \$14,500 a year to maintain one acre of traditional parkland.

To help offset any ongoing operational and maintenance costs, the Council could direct staff to investigate the viability of selling the naming rights of the dog park to a private corporation. The Council could also consider establishing an adopt a park program in which volunteers would perform routine or special maintenance activities in adopted areas or any other viable option as determined appropriate by the Council.

It is unknown if any municipalities within Los Angeles or California utilize corporate sponsorships to offset ongoing maintenance costs for their smaller park facilities and/or amenities. However, this is a standard practice in the private sector where sports arenas, conference centers, and concert venues are named after a corporation to help offset operational costs. The City of New York is considering selling the naming rights to sponsor facilities and amenities within its park system to offset operational and maintenance costs. The City of New York recently released a Request for Proposal allowing companies, foundations, or individuals to bid on naming 631 basketball courts and 55 dog runs. This proposal does have several benefits but it also has its fair share of controversies in that essentially the agency would be commercializing the use of their public spaces.

The City of Sacramento currently operates the partners in parks program, which allows volunteers to adopt a playground, playfield, landscape, garden, section of a large park, preserve, or trail. Program volunteers perform routine or special stewardship activities in the adopted areas. Activities vary by season but volunteers provide the following services: gardening, weeding, pruning, planting, brush clearing, spreading mulch, litter and invasive plant removal, and playground or play field preservation or improvement.

The Council will have to weigh the value of implementing similar programs to reduce ongoing maintenance and operational costs associated with a Dog Park. However, should it be the desire of the Council to further pursue any of the options as presented, additional analysis will need to be performed.

CONCLUSION

In alignment with the PRCS Department's FY 2012-2013 WPG and the Council's infrastructure and transportation goals, if it is the desire of the City Council, staff will bring back a discussion regarding the viability of developing a dog park.

Staff believes that developing a dog park facility is viable and aligns with the PRCS Department's overall mission; however, taking into consideration on how the Board has prioritized (ranked) the dog park project and combined with existing infrastructure needs, staff believes that the PRCS Department should focus on rehabilitating and maintaining the City's existing infrastructure needs before adding any additional amenities to its park inventory.

LIST OF EXHIBITS

- Exhibit A:** PRCS Board's PowerPoint Presentation - March 11, 2010
- Exhibit B:** Memo to City Council - April 6, 2010
- Exhibit C:** PRCS Infrastructure Plan as Adopted by the Board – January 12, 2012
- Exhibit D:** Duplication of Services Map
- Exhibit E:** Potential Dog Park Sites

City of Burbank Dog Park

1. Do you own a dog(s)?

☐ Yes

☐ No

2. Would you be supportive of an off-leash dog park in Burbank?

☐ Yes

☐ No

3. Which location mentioned below in your opinion would be best suited for the dog park?

☐ Starlight Bowl- Wood lot area

☐ Johnny Carson Park- South

☐ Whitnall Highway- Easement

☐ Interstate 5 HOV right of way

4. How often would you use a dog park?

☐ Once a month

☐ Once a week

☐ Multiple times per week

☐ Never

5. What time of day would you most likely use a dog park?

☐ 6am to 9am

☐ 4pm to 7pm

☐ Other _____

6. What is your resident zip code?

7. Do you Currently use a dog park(s) in another city?

☐ Yes

☐ No

(If yes, please list)

City of Burbank Dog Park

8. If you answered yes to Question 7 where is the dog park located?

9. What features are essential in a successful fenced dog park? Rank your top three priorities from 1-3, with 1 being the highest priority.

	1	2	3
Seperate area for small dogs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Double gated entry	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Drinking water	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pet waste station	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Restrooms	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parking close to site	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Shade	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Benches	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Staff/ Volunteer monitors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other suggested features	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. For health and safety reasons, dogs using the dog park must be licensed and be current on all vaccinations. Would you be willing to show proof of proper vaccination and obtain a dog license so that your dog(s) may use the dog park?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

11. In order to have a successful dog park, owners must be responsible for cleaning up after their dogs. Would you pick up after your pet if pet stations were provided?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

12. Dog parks can be staffed or unstaffed (depending upon funding). Would you be more likely to use a dog park that was staffed or unstaffed?

- ☐ Self-monitored
☐ Staffed
☐ Makes no difference

City of Burbank Dog Park

13. If the dog park were "self monitored" by citizens-users of the park (unstaffed), would you feel comfortable politely asking an individual to remove thier dog from the park if you believed thier dog was acting aggressively?

☐ Yes

☐ No

14. The Dog Park will need financial start up and working capital. If it is necessary to fund raise among the public, would you be willing to contribute? If so, please complete any that apply below:

-Annual financial amount

-One time donation of money/ equipment

-Weekly/ monthly/ quarterly services

-Can you recommend any individuals, businesses and/or corporations who we may contact that would be willing to support or aid in fundraising for a Dog Park?

15. Would you be interested in participating as a volunteer, if so please provide your name, email and/ or telephone number below for further contact with full details.

Name:

Email Address:

Phone Number:

16. Do you have other recommendations, concerns, or comments?

Dog Parks near Burbank



Potential Dog Park Sites



1. **Brace Canyon Park (City-Owned Property)**
2. **Bel Aire Park (City-Owned Property)**
3. **Johnny Carson Park North (City-Owned Property)**
4. **Johnny Carson Park South (LA Owned Property-leased to City)**
5. **Whitnall Highway Easement (City-Owned Property)**
6. **Whitnall Highway Easement (Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Owned Property)**
7. **Palm Park (City-Owned Property)**
8. **Starlight Bowl Parking Lot at Stough Park (City-Owned Property)**
9. **Wood Lot Area (City-Owned Property)**
10. **Cabrini Basin (City-Owned Property)**
11. **Interstate 5- HOV Right of Way (City-Owned Property)**

EXHIBIT F

Park, Recreation and Community Services Department Off-Leash Dog Park Design Standards

AMENITY	DESIGN STANDARDS FOR EACH PARK TYPE	
	COMMUNITY (Medium) 2-10 Acres; 5 mile Service Radius)	NEIGHBORHOOD (Small) (1/2-2 Acres; Variable Service Area)
Perimeter Fencing	6' high commercial grade chain- link	6' high commercial grade chain- link
Internal Fencing	3 separate areas: 2 areas for rotating use; 1 small dog area	optional; varies
Double- Gated Main Entryway	12'x 12' min; paved area	12'x12' min; paved area
Maintenace Gate	6' high commercial grade chain- link x 10' wide min.; sliding; 1 per fenced area	6' high commercial grade chain- link x 10' wide min.; sliding; 1 per fenced area
Surface Material	both turf grass and non- organic areas	varies
Paved Pathway	8'- 10' wide; loop	8'- 10' wide; loop
Unpaved Trail	n/a	n/a
People Drinking Fountain	1 per park	1 per park
Dog Drinking Feature	1 per fenced area	1 per fenced area
Water Quick Coupler	1 every 150' radius in each fenced area	1 every 150' radius in each fenced area
Waste Bag Dispenser	1 per acre min; evenly space; near trash receptacles; at entryway	1 per acre min; evenly space; near trash receptacles; at entryway
Trash Receptacle	1 per acre min; at entryway; not near benches or ramadas	1 per acre min; at entryway; not near benches
Bench	6'-8' long w/ back; 3-4 per acre	6'-8' long w/ back; 3-4 per acre
Shade Structure / Ramada	1 per fenced area min; w/ benches or tables	optional
Parking	35 paved stalls min.	optional
Restroom	1 small size	n/a
Trees	15 per acre min.	15 per acre min.
Regulatory / Informational Signage	at entry	at entry
Wash- Off Station	optional; 12'x12' paved; hose- bib w/6' hose w/ spray nozzle; 1 per park	optional

